

JUL-11-11 17:55

FROM: McCormick, Paulding, & Huber

+860 527 0464

T-048 P.001/002 F-419



McCormick, Paulding & Huber LLP
Intellectual Property Law

Offices in
Hartford, CT &
Springfield, MA

PHOTO@ip-lawyers.com
web site: <http://www.ip-lawyers.com>

CONNECTICUT OFFICE
CityPlace II
185 Asylum Street
Hartford, CT 06103-3408
Tel: 860-549-9290
Fax: 860-527-0464

FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION

TO: Examiner Colleen Quinn
FAX NO: (571)273-6289
FROM: Sergio Chung
DATE: July 11, 2011

NUMBER OF PAGES (including cover sheet): 2

MESSAGE:

Dear Examiner Quinn,
Please see the following regarding our telephone interview for
Application Serial No. 10/585,005.

The information contained in this facsimile may contain confidential information. It is only for the use of the individual or entity named. If you are not the intended recipient, or the employee or agent responsible to deliver it to the intended recipient, you are notified that your dissemination, distribution or copying of this communication is strictly prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please immediately notify us by telephone, and return the original facsimile to us at the above address via U.S. postal service and destroy any copies.

JUL-11-11 17:35 FROM-McCormick, Paulding, & Huber

+680 527 0464

T-849 P 002/002 F-419

Topics for Discussion for Telephone Interview re: Application Serial No. 10/585,005

Dear Examiner Quinn,

For our interview on Wednesday, I would like to discuss independent claims 88, 96, 101 and 103. Claims 88, 96, 101 and 103 are presently rejected as obvious over U.S. Patent No. 6,858,663 to Colditz et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 2,338,432 to Wilson and U.S. Patent No. 880,359 to Dudley.

With respect to claims 88 and 96, I would like to discuss the recitation of "an alignment arrangement configured to extend outward from the perimeter of the first endless frame structure." In the Office Action, it appears that this recitation is being broadly interpreted to include prior art structures that extend axially below or above the frame but that do not extend radially outward from the frame. It would be helpful to know if our understanding of the rejection is correct, and whether an amendment directed to the alignment arrangement extending radially outward from the perimeter of the first endless frame structure would overcome the outstanding rejection.

With respect to claims 101 and 103, I would like to discuss the recitation of "a docking arrangement comprising a pair of flexible belts." Dudley is cited as showing this recitation. However, it appears that Dudley shows a single chain (21) rather than two flexible belts, as recited in claims 101 and 103. It would be helpful to know if we are referring to the correct disclosure in Dudley being cited against claims 101 and 103, and whether our understanding of the rejection is correct.

It is my understanding that you will be calling me on Wednesday at 1PM at (860) 549-5260 ext. 1008.

Thank you and I look forward to speaking with you.

Best regards,
Sergio